DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 076 CS 205 797

AUTHOR Purves, Alan C.
TITLE Culture and the Deep Structure of the Literature Curriculum.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 13p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Differences; *Cultural Influences; *Curriculum Design; *Curriculum Research; Educational Research; *Foreign Countries; *Literature

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the notion that three radically different deep structures operate in literature education today, providing a useful way to examine and describe a culture's influence on its literature curricula. The structures are identified as (1) imitative--assumes that literature forms a heritage and that reading, absorbing, and imitating that heritage will transmit cultural values to the young; (2) analytic--stresses the development of students' critical faculties and their abilities to comprehend, analyze, and respond to works studied; and (3) generative--stresses individual and personal growth through reading rather than the development of critical skills. Data collected in a number of countries by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) are analyzed with reference to these curriculum structures, and patterns or typologies of national literature curricula are identified. (AEA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Culture and the Deep Structure of the Literature Curriculum

ALAN C. PURVES
University of Illinois

ED191076

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alan C. Purves

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

I have found it helpful to conceive of the literature curriculum by borrowing from linguistics a metaphor distinguishing the deep and surface structures of sentences. "John hit the ball" and "The ball was hit by John" have different surface structures: one is active, the other passive. Both, however, describe the same action and thus have similar deep structures. "John hit the ball" and "The ball hit John" have similar surface structures—noun-verb-noun—but since quite opposite events are described, the deep structures differ. Transferring the metaphor, let's look at two apparently different literature curricula. One requires students to learn the names of all the literary devices in plays by Shakespeare and read all the appropriate background; the other has students learn the names of every shot and camera angle in films by Bergman and read widely about filmmaking. Since both curricula attach great importance to historical and critical background, their deep structures are similar. Now consider how two curricula might treat the same poem. One asks that students memorize the poem and recite facts about the author, the other that they write an essay on the poem's symbolism. While these curricula have similar surface structures, their deep structures are quite different. One is extrinsic, the other intrinsic.

Three Deep Structures of Literature Curricula

The deep structure–surface structure distinction has been especially useful in a recent attempt to examine and evaluate the literature curricula from different cultures, where pronounced differences in content and organization tend to obscure underlying similarities of intent and orientation. The IEA study of literature education in ten countries[1] reveals many obvious surface differences in literature curricula, both within and among countries. Most striking, of course, are differences in the literary selections studied;

I would like to thank Bryant Fillion for a particularly helpful critique of an earlier draft of this paper.

CS205 797

it is neither surprising nor illuminating to say that the Swedish curriculum deals with poets like Gunnar Ekelöf and Eric Lindegren, and the curriculum in the United States with Robert Frost and T. S. Eliot. Yet beneath this diversity of surface structures, culturally characteristic deep structures seem to operate, structures which cannot be characterized solely by reference to the educational programs themselves, but which seem nevertheless to function effectively as imperatives that shape literature education within a culture. The priorities and intentions of literary experts reveal these structures; so do students' characteristic patterns of response to literature.

A review of data from the IEA study and of the history of literature teaching in the United States and in Europe have led me to conclude that three radically different deep structures operate in literature education today, and that these deep structures provide a useful way to examine and describe a culture's influence on its literature curricula. In any one historical era or in any one country these structures may appear in a less than pure state; even so, they remain distinguishable. In describing them here, I cite their apologists, not necessarily their founders. Like many concepts throughout the history of ideas, these deep structures have murky origins.

The Imitative Structure

The first structure I would call *imitative*. Historically, it is the oldest structure, originating in the West when Latin and Greek held sway, and students were educated by memorizing and imitating classical models. In England its strongest proponent was Matthew Arnold, who advocated a cultured elite that would recognize literary excellence by "touchstones" (1895, p. 17): poetry that was "excellent rather than inferior, sound rather than unsound, true rather than untrue" (p. 5). Although Arnold envisioned an international culture that somehow transcended the limitations of language and nation, most spokesmen for the imitative were much more nationalistic and historical. On the continent, people like Sainte-Beuve and Taine reestablished the importance of French literary history and biography, setting out nationalistic models of excellence which could presumably become the basis for education within the culture. In the United States, Emerson became the spokesman for the Americanism of American writers.

Nearly a century later, T. S. Eliot addressed Norwegian expatriates in wartime London: "I think it important that every people should have its own poetry, not simply for those who enjoy poetry—such people could always learn other languages and enjoy their poetry—but because it actually makes a difference to the society as a whole, and that means to people who do not enjoy poetry" (1957, p. 18). Eliot advocated a national literature as providing a force for social cohesion and, by extension, he saw the schools as providing the means whereby that national literature could work its cohesive effect. While Arnold perceived a distinction between the cosmopolitan elite and the philistine mass, Eliot saw the elite as tied to the larger populace through the bonds of a common language:

> The development of culture does not mean bringing everybody up to the front, which amounts to no more than making everyone keep step: it means the main-

renance of such an *élite* with the main and more passive body of readers not lagging more than a generation or so behind. The changes and developments of sensibility which appear first in a few will work themselves into the language gradually, through their influence on other, and more readily popular authors; and by the time they have become well-established, a new advance will be called for.... If you follow the influence of poetry [Eliot concludes] through those readers who are most affected by it, to those people who never read at all, you will find it present everywhere. At least you will find it if the national culture is living and healthy, for in a healthy society there is a continuous reciprocal influence and interaction of each part upon the others. [p. 21–22]

Whether the end is Arnold's class cohesion or Eliot's cultural cohesion through the weight of tradition, nearly every national curriculum is partly based on the assumption that literature forms a heritage and that reading, absorbing, and imitating that heritage will transmit cultural values to the young. Following the curricular implications of Sainte-Beuve, Emerson, or Eliot, one tends to emerge with a historical curriculum, either rigidly national or more broadly conceived (e.g., Anglo-American or Scandinavian). Following Arnold, one tends to emerge with what observers in the United States have come to call a "humanities curriculum," which emphasizes the sweep of Western (or Asian, or African) literature and stresses good ideas more than great men. The difference is one of breadth of perspective, an important difference but not a radical one. The Finnish curriculum expresses a narrower view: "The objective of instruction in the lower and middle grades of the secondary school is that students should understand and internalize what is read.... Special attention must be paid to the manifestation of the national spirit in literature" (Purves 1973, p. 45). In Iran the national report says, "Literary history is highly uncritical.... In the early years it is told in hyperbolic generalizations" (p. 46). In Sweden and Chile the emphasis seems to be more on the literature of high culture than on the literature representing a national spirit, though the national emphasis is present, as it is in most countries in the IEA group.

The imitative literature curriculum implies that the school is a conservative force in society, transmitting the heritage, performing the sorts of initiatory rites which were once the property of religious groups, and providing students with the morality of the culture. Instruction may focus on deriving moral precepts and outlooks from the literature, but more commonly it focuses on reading and remembering the works, learning such information as provides a historical context for the work, and applying the literature to that context or the context to the literature—in either case seeing how the work mirrors the culture in which it was produced.

For the teacher, the imitative curriculum provides a clear sense of standards as well as a justification for his own education, which probably involved studying the literary canon he will now "pass on" to his students. Behind the standards he upholds and the selection of works he teaches is the authority of the past, in most cases, although there may well be various forms of revisionism, as can be seen in ethnic and women's studies. Characteristically, the imitative curriculum refers to historically and culturally established "standards of excellence" when seeking answers to such ques-

tions as "What will these students need to know and understand in today's world?" and "How can this subject matter best be conveyed to them?"

The Analytic Structure

The second deep structure of literature curricula I would call *analytic*. A scientific or semi-scientific structure, it is based on the work of literary critics and aestheticians. Analytic criticism is a relatively recent phenomenon (although there were roots in the nineteenth century, particularly among the prosodic critics like George Saintsbury). One of the great theoreticians of analytic criticism, Northrop Frye, writes:

> In literature we have both a theory and a practice. The practice is the production of literature by writers of all types, from geniuses to hacks, from those who write out of the deepest agonies of the spirit to those who write for fun. The theory of literature is what I mean by criticism, the activity of uniting literature with society, and with the different contexts that literature itself has. ... The great bulk of criticism is teaching, at all levels from kindergarten to graduate school. [Frye 1964, p. 128]

In his major treatise, *The Anatomy of Criticism*, Frye (1957) says that one cannot teach literature; one can only teach criticism: the application of logical discourse to a work of literature and the superimposition of some theoretical structure on the work—whether that structure be linguistic, rhetorical, or interpretive. Able to apply his skills to any verbal structure, the trained literary critic often becomes a cultural critic or a critic of political figures, as can be seen in the pages of most intellectual journals.

One kind of analytic critic focuses attention on the individual selection, purposefully eliminating from consideration any other works by the same writer and any historical or background material. Such a procedure was set forth by the New Critics, most strikingly in the influential textbook *Understanding Poetry*, by Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren (1960), which first appeared in 1938 and which influenced two generations of American critics and teachers. A second kind of analytic critic scans across works, considering genres, themes, and styles. In a few cases, particularly in stylistic criticism, such aids to empirical research as the computer have been employed. By comparison of work to work and style to style, a critic might order the products of man's imagination and derive an apotheosis of the aesthetic in life, though few reach such heights. Most are content to treat the phenomena of literature rationally, if not scientifically.

Literature education based on the analytic structure stresses the development of students' critical faculties, their abilities to comprehend, analyze, and respond to works studied. In the classroom, the analytic curriculum takes many forms, which appear to depend partly on the school of criticism dominant in the culture at the time. In general, however, the principles of structured inquiry are stressed. There is considerable reference in curriculum rationales to "critical skills," processes, and the performance of certain operations. Whether through didactic or heuristic teaching, students are provided with structures to consider, problems to solve, devices to use, and procedures to master. The emphasis is on the development of students'

technical proficiency in confronting, analyzing, and responding to literature, and—at least when transactional criticism dominates—in examining their responses. Although the critical framework stressed may be relatively new, such as transactional criticism, or traditional, such as genre criticism, the analytic curriculum appears inherently less conservative than the imitative.

The analytic deep structure is evident to some extent in nearly all curricula surveyed in the IEA study. In Belgium there is frequent mention of *analyse textuelle*, in the United States, of study of genres. In Finland the emphasis is psychological: "An artistic creation deserves special attention as a psychological document. An author is not approached through the important dates and events in his life, but instead his work must be studied to reveal his personality, temperament, and development as a writer" (Purves, pp. 51–52). In Sweden, the analytic structure competes with the historical, particularly at the upper levels. Literary education based on an analytic deep structure is training in verbalizing about the literary response rather than imitative training of the aesthetic sensibility; and in many countries, the literature section of university entrance examinations involves the analysis and interpretation of unfamiliar texts. Of the European countries involved in the study, only in Italy is the analysis entirely of texts already studied in a historical framework, and then technical analysis challenges the dominance of the historical point of view. One may conclude with some confidence that in most Western countries, the analytic-technological approach to literature has come to rival the imitative-humanistic.

The Generative Structure

The third deep structure of the literature curriculum I call the *generative*, a structure influenced by the impact of Freud on criticism and John Dewey on literature education. The American critic Lionel Trilling writes, "No literature has ever been so shockingly personal as that of our time—it asks every question that is forbidden in polite society. It asks us if we are content with our marriages, with our family lives, . . . with our friends. . . . The questions asked by our literature are not about our culture but about ourselves" (1965, p. 8). Trilling goes on to say that "the literature had to be dealt with in the terms it announced for itself" (p. 13). Of his students, he says, "I must think it possible that in ways and to a degree which they have kept secret they have responded directly and personally to what they have read" (pp. 27–28).

Another Freudian critic, Norman Holland, has written:

> Each of us reads in his own characteristic way, that is as an expression of his particular identity theme. . . . This reading style is deeply engrained, far more deeply than even a professional's training as a reader. Far from changing one's reading style, critical skills, specialized knowledge, and the experience of many books will all serve as ways of fulfilling it and carrying it into practice. [1975, p. 114]

Holland seems to deny any commonality of response to literature; but there are limits upon the uniqueness of perception and response, limits set forth

by Freudian constructs themselves and by the constraints of language, experience, and culture.

The influence of John Dewey comes from his philosophical support of the Freudian position, particularly as it is set forth in "Knowing and the Known" (Dewey 1973, passim), and later made specific to literature in Louise Rosenblatt's *Literature as Exploration*. She speaks of the fact that the "poem" is the result of a transaction between reader and text, that the poem read is not the poem written (1968, passim). The point has been reaffirmed by the structuralist critics in France who refuse to accept the purity of the poem and see it as a set of structures imposed by poet and critic. Rosenblatt sets forth the pedagogical implications of this critical position:

> Teaching becomes a matter of improving the individual's capacity to evoke meaning from the text by leading him to reflect self-critically on this process. The starting point for growth must be each individual's efforts to marshal his resources and organize a response relevant to the stimulus of the printed page. The teacher's task is to foster fruitful interactions—or, more precisely, transactions between individual readers and individual literary works. [pp. 26–27]

One implication of this curricular thrust is that the norms of culture, heritage, or technical proficiency will not hold. A new set of norms—sincerity, openness, self-concern, individuality mingled with respect for the individuality of others—replaces them. There are obvious similarities between the analytic and generative structures. It should be noted, for example, that the latter incorporates a concern for critical acumen and for analysis of the reader's responses to a work. But the generative curriculum stresses the individual and his personal growth through reading rather than the development of critical skills. In the classroom, the generative structure often takes the form of unstructured inquiry, focusing on students' experiences with literature but having no predetermined end in sight beyond the inquiry itself, which is presumed to have value in leading to the students' own goals rather than to teacher-determined objectives.

In practice, this deep structure has found expression in relatively few curricula, most commonly in those school systems where comprehensive education has made its greatest inroads. It is referred to in England ("the student should express what he *felt* and *thought*"), in New Zealand ("for criticism and appreciation, absolute sincerity should be the basis") (Purves, p. 46) and in the *läroplan* in Sweden, as well as in the pronouncements of some curriculum writers in the United States. It now appears most strikingly in curricula for students at the upper elementary or early secondary levels; but it has gained little currency at the upper secondary level, perhaps because these curricula are still dependent on the university, which still holds to either the imitative or the analytic structure.

Deep Structures and the IEA Data

These three structures—the imitative, the analytic, and the generative—cannot be found in their pure state in any of the countries in the IEA survey. Italy and Iran are closest to the purely imitative, Belgium and Chile

to the purely analytic, and England, in one of its major strands, is close to the purely generative. Nevertheless, the three hypothetical deep structures I have described account for major schools of thought which are considered important in shaping literature education. They provide a useful framework for examining diverse literary curricula which present a bewildering array of surface structures. Furthermore, the three structures prove useful in examining and interpreting the IEA data on the work and thought of students with regard to literature and the influence of the curriculum on students. If the deep structures operate through the curriculum as a kind of cultural imperative, their influence should be manifested in students' approaches to literature. This does in fact seem to be the case.

One key aspect of the IEA study was the attempt to identify students' patterns of response to literature. Surely one result of a literature curriculum is that students approach the works they read in particular ways, behaving towards the works in characteristic fashion. It seems likely, then, that the approach will be manifest in the types of questions students ask about what they read. A student reared in the imitative curriculum might well tend to ask about the values reflected in a work, its historical background, and its worth as a cultural document. The analytic curriculum might dispose the student to inquire about the work's literary devices, structure, symbols, values as an aesthetic expression, and relationship to other works of its genre. From the generative curriculum would come a penchant for questions dealing with the feelings aroused by the work, its relationship to the reader's life, and its effectiveness in evoking a response. These different points of view may be oversimplifications, perhaps, but they do seem to reflect the operational differences among the three structures as they might be modified in actual school situations.

In the study, students were asked to read various short stories and to select from a list of twenty questions those five they thought most important to their understanding of each work read. They were also asked to choose the five most important questions generally, without reference to a specific selection. The results of this questionnaire produced what we called a response profile.[2]

Students and Schools

Several of the study's findings relate to cultural and curricular influences on the student. A first look at these findings might imply that schools have little effect on students. For example, interest level seems to depend more on the cultural climate at home than on the school curriculum. Reading ability is largely dependent on the degree of a student's interest in reading and—even more important—on his verbal level rather than on the literature curriculum at school. The results of the IEA study suggest that the ability to read critically is related to reading ability. Nevertheless, the school seems to have a strong effect in modifying responses to literature. In general fourteen year-olds did not exhibit very clear patterns of preference and rejection among the questions. With eighteen-year-olds, however, these patterns were sharply etched. It seems reasonable to conclude that four years

of schooling may well be a factor in the development of a student's cognitive style or characteristic approach to literary works. Chance occurrence for any one question was 25% of the students (five questions out of twenty per student). Therefore, the standard deviation from 25% indicates the degree to which a population seems to have a sharply etched response profile. At age fourteen, the mean standard deviation for all countries was 10.1; at age eighteen, it was 14.4. The rise was sharpest in Finland and England, least strong in Iran and the United States (Purves, p. 202).

With regard to the three hypothesized deep structures, this tendency towards a sharpened critical focus was less striking than were the differences in questions chosen between countries. An analysis of variance indicated that nineteen of the twenty questions varied according to country with differences significant at the .0001 level; the twentieth question, with a P value less than .037 was "What does this story tell me about people or ideas in general?" This finding, together with the first, would raise strong suspicions that in each country students were indeed learning to approach literature according to some cultural or pedagogical imperative. The question remains as to whether the imperatives are described by the three curricular structures.

Emerging Typologies

During the course of the study, a committee of experts in each of the countries was asked to rank the twenty questions in order of importance in the curriculum. Although the experts were not asked to think in terms of the three deep structures (nor were teachers or students), those structures may be applied to the twenty questions in a post hoc fashion. Within the imitative structure were questions dealing with the historical background and genre of the work ("When was the story written?"), with the moral import and moral appropriateness of the work ("Is there a lesson to be learned from [the story]?"), and with the work as a generalization upon some theme. The humanistic and the purely historical aspects of the imitative curriculum were thus both set forth. Representing the analytic structure were questions dealing with language, imagery, point of view, plot, and relation of form to content as well as with symbolism and the aesthetic success of the work ("Is the story well written?"). For the generative structure there were questions dealing with the readers' feelings, with the relationship of the work to the readers' lives, and with the readers' sense of the affective power of the work ("What emotions does [the story] arouse in me?" "Does the story succeed in getting me involved in the situation?"). Two questions seemed to cross categories: one involving a recounting of the events of the work and another involving the motivation of the characters in a work (Purves, p. 335).

As might be expected, an examination of the choices of experts, teachers, and students in a country reveals very few pure structures. All groups appear either eclectic or unsystematic. Some typologies, however, are possible.[3] The experts' choices imply that there are three purely imitative cultures: Chile, Finland, and Sweden. (Italy is close to being purely imita-

tive on the basis of curriculum guides.) Iran and Flemish- and French-speaking Belgium claim to be analytic in temperament (although the curriculum guides there appear to belie the choices of the experts, indicating, perhaps, a schism between schools of thought). Some United States experts adhere to the imitative school, others to the analytic. No country is purely generative in approach, although the experts in England and New Zealand claim a generative influence. England claims to be divided between an analytic and a generative school, New Zealand between an imitative and a generative.

Patterns of Discord

Table 1 indicates the pattern of concord between expert, teacher, and student. The figures represent an index of agreement on the five or six most popular questions for each group. Such an index is rough because of the closeness of the runner-up questions to these first few. (In England the students included the four questions preferred by the experts among their first seven, but not among the first six.) The indices of agreement may also include one or both of the nonclassifiable questions, so that although the deep structures differ, the actual questions preferred may coincide. One can see patterns of discord in Belgium, where teachers appear to maintain concerns different from experts and students; in Finland, where the students do not share teachers' and experts' concern with history or humanism; in Iran, where the experts do not seem to see the curriculum the way that teachers and students do; and in New Zealand, where the students persist in being analytic, despite the efforts of experts and teachers.

Nor is there perfect harmony between groups in the other countries. In French-speaking Belgium the experts are concerned with form, but the teachers and students with content. In Chile the experts are more concerned with thematics, and the teachers and students with history. In England the students are much more concerned with form and much less concerned with formal evaluation than are teachers or experts. In Iran the students are more concerned with history than with thematics, but in Italy the reverse obtains. In Sweden the students display a minor interest in history and a major one in analysis and thematics. The students of the United States tend towards analysis and away from history.

One might look upon the teachers' choices as the operating curriculum and the experts' choices as the official curriculum. In some countries the teachers lag behind certain curriculum reforms that the experts have promulgated—a natural occurrence, perhaps, since teachers may well have been trained a generation before the current experts, and thus may be serving a conservative function. Such would seem to be the case in Chile, Finland, and Iran where the teachers represent an older, historical strand of the imitative curriculum, while the experts have moved into an analytic phase. In England, a different situation seems to obtain: the teachers express a viewpoint more appropriate to the rise in the numbers of secondary modern and comprehensive school students, but the experts remain supporters of a curriculum geared to prepare students for A-level examinations. In New

Table 1/Relationship between Curricular Emphases of Expert, Teacher, and Student[a]

	Experts' Emphasis	Teachers' Emphasis	% Teacher Agreement with Experts	18-year-old Students' Emphasis	% Student Agreement with Experts	% Student Agreement with Teachers
Flemish Belgium	Analytic	Imitative Analytic	50	Analytic	40	50
French Belgium	Analytic	Imitative Analytic	0	Analytic	20	40
Chile	Imitative	Imitative	40	Analytic Imitative	80	60
England	Analytic Generative	Generative Analytic	75	Analytic Generative	75	60
Finland	Imitative	Imitative	60	Analytic Generative	40	40
Iran	Analytic	Imitative	20	Imitative	20	40
Italy	Imitative[b] Analytic	Imitative Generative	—	Imitative Analytic	—	50
New Zealand	Imitative Generative	Imitative Generative	40	Analytic	20	20
Sweden	Imitative	Imitative	40	Analytic Imitative	60	40
United States	Imitative Analytic	Analytic Imitative	60	Analytic Imitative	60	40

[a]If two terms appear in a cell, the first one is dominant.

[b]The Italian experts' opinion is extrapolated from curriculum guides; indices of agreement cannot therefore be derived.

Zealand, another situation shows the experts and teachers thinking in terms of theme and the students' personal reactions to the work, while the students are considering the formal analytic aspects of response to literature. Is it that these students are concerned with university examinations and know that these sorts of questions are what really count? We don't know.

Deep Structures and Curriculum Realities

The anomalies between student, teacher, and expert may reflect many phenomena, such as curriculum changes reflecting democratization of the schools or changes in the critical tradition of a country. Until further investigation has cast more light on these discrepancies, we can only speculate on their causes. We can, however, look at the matter in a different fashion. If one assumes that the teachers' chosen questions represent the desired response (the questions teachers emphasize in the classroom), and that the students' choices represent the approximation of the student to the teacher (the questions students emphasize in their working time), then we can see the teachers' selections as a criterion which the students may approach. If we do so and think of the students' choices as an achievement score—the closer approximation to the teacher indicating the better student—then we can begin to see what makes a successful literature student.

A first glance at a correlation matrix for two countries (New Zealand and Chile) indicates that the usual variables—home background, age, sex, type of school, number of books in the home—are of less power than are those variables that speak of the number of years or hours a student has spent studying literature. The more time and thought a student has devoted to literature, the more closely that student approximates the teacher. Apart from reading ability, the degree of approximation is the prevailing and operating criterion of literary achievement. The correlations with home variables range around .15; those with amount of literature study range around .50. This is a dramatic difference, a difference sufficient to indicate that schooling is effective in promulgating a preferred set of responses. Whether that preferred set of responses approximates the deep structure of a country's curriculum—a pure and rigorous approach to literature—is not clear. There are a number of intervening variables, particularly the lag between expert and teacher, and the very impurity of a curriculum as it begins to adapt itself to a large and diverse population. Although they may be diluted within any one country, the deep structures of literature curricula seem an adequate reflection of curriculum realities, and they are indeed felt in the response patterns of students, teachers, and experts.

The study clearly shows that school is an important determinant in the way a student looks at a literary work. Literature teaching can influence people to ask certain questions about a short story, to read with a certain point of view. Inevitably, cognitive styles learned in the classroom have important ramifications in daily life. The makers of literature curricula cannot ignore the relationship between vicarious and virtual experience; they must accept partial responsibility for shaping the cognitive styles of students. This, ultimately, is the most pressing issue raised by the IEA study.

NOTES

1. The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) studied literature education in Belgium (divided into French-speaking and Flemish-speaking), Chile, England, Finland, Iran, Italy, New Zealand, Sweden, and the United States (Purves 1973). The international literature committee (J. N. Britton, A. W. Foshay, G. Hansson, G. de Landsheere, and A. C. Purves) quickly concluded that the study of literature education had to contain descriptive elements as well as elements deriving from some absolute criterion of achievement. The committee developed for analysis a grid showing on the horizontal axis the main areas of content in literature—literary works, contextual or background information, critical information, and cultural information (myths and folklore) and showing on the vertical axis the major behaviors—recognizing and recalling, applying one kind of information to an area of content, expressing a response, and valuing. This grid was sent to a committee of experts on the literature curriculum in each of the countries.
2. For a full discussion of these findings, see Purves, chapters 5 and 6.
3. Under other names, these typologies are discussed in Purves, chapter 9.

REFERENCES

ARNOLD, MATTHEW. "The study of poetry." In *Essays in criticism: Second series.* London: Macmillan, 1895.

BROOKS, CLEANTH, AND WARREN, ROBERT PENN, eds. *Understanding poetry*, 3d edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

DEWEY, JOHN, AND BENTLEY, ARTHUR F. "Knowing and the known." In *Useful procedures of inquiry*, by Rollo Handy and E. C. Harwood. Great Barrington, Mass.: Behavioral Research Council, 1973.

ELIOT, T. S. "The social function of poetry." In *On poetry and poets.* London: Faber and Faber, 1957.

FRYE, NORTHROP. *The educated imagination.* Bloomington, Ind.: University Press, 1964.

———. *The anatomy of criticism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

HOLLAND, NORMAN. *Poems in persons.* New York: Norton, 1973.

PURVES, ALAN C. *Literature education in ten countries.* Stockholm: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), 1973.

ROSENBLATT, LOUISE. *Literature as exploration.* New York: Noble and Noble, 1938.

TRILLING, LIONEL. "On the teaching of modern literature." In *Beyond culture: Essays on literature and learning.* New York: Viking, 1965.